



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

V.—NOTES ON THE AGAMEMNON OF AESCHYLUS.

The following observations occurred in a course of lectures on the Oresteia, which I had the pleasure of giving at Oxford last Summer Term; and although I cannot hope that they will in every case be new to the readers of the AMERICAN JOURNAL OF PHILOLOGY, yet I trust that they may be found neither so trite nor so ill-founded as to be wholly unacceptable.

i. The fact that Aeschylus nowhere mentions Mycenae has been remarked by many scholars,—amongst others by Bishop Wordsworth in his book on Greece, and more recently by Professor Mahaffy. It has been usual to connect it with the suppression of Mycenae by the Argives in B. C. 468, which is mentioned by Plutarch. It is certainly curious, as Mr. Mahaffy has pointed out, that an event of such importance should not be noticed by Thucydides. But his account of the period in question is confessedly a mere fragmentary sketch, and the importance of the event is rather a reason for supposing the tradition which records it to be genuine. However this may be, we recognize in Eum. 762–774 clear evidence of the desire of Athens to conciliate Argos, and the exclusive prominence attached to that city by Aeschylus may reasonably be associated with this desire.

But without dwelling on political motives, it is interesting to observe that throughout the Oresteia, Aeschylus assumes a conception of the circumstances of “the tale of Pelops’ line,” which differs in many particulars from that which may be roughly spoken of as common to Homer and Sophocles.

This is only one of many examples of the truth, that in the age of Tragedy, and indeed long afterwards, the outlines of legendary history in Greece were scarcely less indefinite than those of mythology.

In Homer and Sophocles, Agamemnon is King of Mycenae, while his brother Menelaus reigns at Sparta. In the Oresteia, on the other hand, it is manifestly presupposed that up to the time of the departure of the fleet for Troy, the two sons of Atreus had jointly exercised at Argos the regal power whose fountainhead was in the palace of the Pelopidae. Their empire was less extensive than that attributed to King Pelasgus in the Supplices, for Phocis

was beyond its boundaries. But the whole of the Peloponnesus was included in it, and Sparta is regarded as non-existent. The return of Menelaus no less than of Agamemnon is looked for by the Argives, as that of their own beloved king, *τῆς δὲ γῆς φίλον χράτος*.¹ Paris, in visiting Menelaus, had come to the house of the Atridae;² and from thence had Helen stolen forth, leaving to her fellow-citizens³ (i. e. to the Argives) the burdensome task of levying war. And while the kings are thus imagined as sharing the same palace,—where in peaceful times we may imagine them as sitting in judgment on the “dread thrones” before the gate,—the site of the palace is not at Mycenae but at Argos. This is proved not only by the omission of the name Mycenae, but by the fact (which travellers testify) that the beacon on M. Arachnaeus would not have been visible from Mycenae, whereas from Argos it would, and also, although this is less significant, from several passages which indicate the nearness of the city to the shore.⁴

Leaving on one side the political tendency which has been above inferred from the Eumenides, and on which it is easy to lay too much stress, we may observe how much this way of conceiving the fable has contributed to the artistic unity and concentration of the trilogy, and still more of the Agamemnon as a single drama, in which the antecedent circumstances have necessarily such an important place.

At the opening we find Clytemnestra in sole possession of the vast palace. First Helen had gone, then Menelaus and Agamemnon with him, and the other daughter of Tyndareus alone was left. She has sent away her son Orestes, and keeps her daughters (and Hermione if she is thought of) in abject subjection, together with the servants of the house. There, amidst the horror-breathing silences she remains alone, completely possessed with the one thought,—the one constant resolve,—to take condign vengeance for her child. That this, and not her attachment to Aegisthus, which came subsequently, nor her jealousy of Chryseis or Cassandra, is her prime motive in the idea of Aeschylus, appears not only from her own words, which may be suspected of hypocrisy, but from those of Calchas, which are repeated with so much emphasis in the first choral ode, *μήμνετ γάρ φοβερὰ παλινορσος οίκονόμος δολία, μνάμων μῆνις τεκνόποιος.*

Although alone in the palace, Clytemnestra is not alone in her desire of revenge. Aegisthus has long since returned from exile,

¹ Ag. 619.

² Ag. 400.

³ Ag. 402.

⁴ Ag. 46, 493, 690, 1.

but while restored to his fatherland is still an exile from the house of the Pelopidae. He is bound in honor to be avenged for his father Thyestes, and his brothers whom Atreus had massacred.

During Agamemnon's stay at Troy these two hatreds had coalesced in one: Clytemnestra, brooding on vengeance and reckless of all else; Aegisthus, likewise loving revenge, but not insensible to the charms of the kingdom and the queen. Still, although suspicion is rife at least within the palace, there has been no overt act of crime, either in the way of adultery or of usurpation. Aegisthus is still assumed to be a stranger to the palace, and no one has ventured openly to question the chastity of the wife of Agamemnon. This occurs for the first time at l. 1625 (see below) after the death of the king. Thus not only the immediate antecedents of Orestes' matricide, but all the antecedents without exception, the Thyestean banquet, the rape of Helen, the departure of both kings, the sending away of Iphigenia for sacrifice, revolve round one local centre, the Argive palace of the Pelopidae. The separation of Menelaus and his ships from the returning fleet is also more pertinent to the action than if he had been bound for Lacedaemon. For the King of Men in his hour of danger is thus deprived of the natural succor which the presence of his brother and yoke-fellow in the kingdom would have afforded, according to the Greek proverb, *'Ἄδελφὸς ἀνδρὶ παρεῖη'*. If the destination of Menelaus had been Lacedaemon and not Argos, the effect of this would be entirely lost.

II.

Having premised so much as to the general scope of the Agamemnon, I proceed to consider some points in the interpretation of particular passages.

Ll. 70, 71.

*ἀπύρων ιερῶν
δρυάς ἀτενεῖς παραθέλξει.*

Since the old explanation of these words, which assumed that the Furies were worshipped without burnt-sacrifice, was rightly discarded on comparing Eum. 108, 9, *καὶ νυκτίσεμνα δεῖπν' ἐπ' ἔσχάρῃ πυρὸς | εὐθον,* subsequent interpreters have contented themselves with supposing "sacrifice to which no fire was put" to be a figurative expression for sins of omission generally, or for all sin. But was the scholiast wrong after all in supposing that the words contain some allusion to the Eriny, and so continue the thought of l. 59?¹ How if we imagine the sacrifice, not as one offered to the

¹ *πέμπει παραβάσιν Ἐρωτίν.*

Erinyes, but as one of which they are the ministers,—and of which the sinner is the victim? That such a notion was not foreign to the mind of Aeschylus appears from the language of the Erinyes themselves in threatening Orestes. See esp. Eum. 305 *καὶ ζῶν με δαισεῖς οὐδὲ πρὸς βωμῷ σφαγεῖς*. The only question is whether the words of the present passage will bear this meaning: “the unrelenting Wrath attending on the rite which employs no fire”: i. e. the anger of the Furies, who in pursuing their victim have no need of “material fire,” since they are able to consume him with their breath,—*νηδόνος πυρί*, Eum. For *ἱερά*, meaning a sacrificial rite, see Hdt. 1, 172; 2, 63.

2. Ll. 55. *μαλαζαῖς ἀδόλουσι παρηγυρίατις*.
ἀδόλουσι means “without guile,” i. e. incapable of deceiving, because the unguent would not have been drawn from its repository in the palace except by the arrival of authentic news. Its consolatory intimations were thus sealed with the authority of the sovereign.

3. Ll. 105-7. *ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνεῖει
 † πειθὼ μολπᾶν
 ἀλκὰν ἔνυφυτος αἰών.*

Neglecting for the moment the two words *πειθὼ μολπᾶν*, the remainder of the sentence admits of being construed thus: “The life that was born with me still breathes down valor from on high.” The *αἰών*, equally with the *ψυχὴ* and the *δαίμων*, is continually spoken of as separable from the person to whom it belongs. But the word *ἀλκὰν* alone would be vague and inappropriate, and requires some further definition. This is supplied by the two words which we have so far neglected, if for *πειθὼ* we read *πειθοῖ*, as an instrumental dative.

*ἔτι γὰρ θεόθεν καταπνεῖει
 † πειθοῖ μολπᾶν
 ἀλκὰν ἔνυφυτος αἰών,*

“Through persuasive song the genius of my life still breathes valor on me from above,”—i. e. Although my bodily strength declines, the Muse is with me still.

4. Ll. 140-4. *τόσον περ εῦφρων ἀ καλὰ
 δρόσοισι λεπτοῖς μαλερῶν λεόντων,
 πάντων τὸ ἀγρούμων φιλομάστοις
 θηρῶν διβριξάλοιστι
 τερπνὰ τούτων
 † αἵτει ἔνυφολα κρᾶναι.*

The difficulty of this passage turns upon the obvious defect of logic which there is in saying "Artemis is angry for the hare, but although so tenderly disposed to all wild creatures, yet she demands a glad fulfilment of the sign. Only I pray Apollo she may not send a storm." These last words show that *τερπνά* means "a fulfilment pleasant for the Greeks," i. e. the sacking of Troy. And what the logic of the place requires is not that Artemis should *demand* this, but that she should not directly oppose it. If by the change of a single letter for *αἰτεῖ* we read *αἰνεῖ*, this requirement is fulfilled :

τερπνὰ τούτων
* *αἰνεῖ ξύμβολα χρᾶναι,*

"She yields assent to the fulfilment of the glad counterpart of this sign."

5. Ll. 196, 7. *παλιμψήχη χρόνον τιθεῖσαι*
 τρίβω.

May not this mean, "Redoubling the effect of delay through wear and tear"? Cp. l. 391, 2, *τρίβω τε καὶ προσβολαῖς | μελαμπαγῆς πέλει.*

6. L. 201. *ἄλλο μῆχαρ.*

This is commonly so explained as to imply that other remedies had been tried and failed; which is of course possible. But according to a familiar idiom it is also possible that *ἄλλο* may simply emphasize the contrast between the evil and the cure for the evil, "A remedy more unendurable even than the cruel storm."

7. L. 224. *παρακοπὰ πρωτοπήμων.*

This is understood to mean "the infatuation which is the first step in a long train of sorrows." But may it not mean "the infatuation which comes of the first plunge into sorrow"?

8. Ll. 249–52. *δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦστι μαθεῖν*
 ἐπιρρέπει
 τὸ μέλλον τὸ δὲ προκλύειν
 † ἐπιγένοντ' ἀν κλόνοις προχαιρέτω.

Although the words *τὸ δὲ προκλύειν* are not by the first hand, they seem to be genuine, and the conjunction *θ*, in l. 241 indicates the loss of a participle such as *προσορωμένα* (O. C. 244), which would restore the correspondence of metre. And the occurrence of the glyconic rhythm in the middle of the strophe is rendered probable by its appearing again at the close in ll. 246, 257. If so much is granted, the corruption in the last line may be removed by inserting *ει* before *κλόνοις* in an emphatic sense, nearly equivalent to *κει*.

*Δίκα δὲ τοῖς μὲν παθοῦσιν μαθεῖν ἐπιρρέπει
τὸ μέλλον· τὸ δὲ προκλύειν,
* ἐπεὶ γένοιτ’ ἄν, * εἰ κλίνοις, προχαιρέτω.*

"A righteous dispensation orders that men shall know the future only through the constraint of suffering it. But as to listening for it beforehand, farewell at once to that, since (even) if you do hear it,¹ it will come to pass." Cp. Suppl. 1047, *δι τοι μόρσιμόν ἐστιν, τὸ γένοιτ’ ἄν.*

9. L. 276. *τις ἀπτερος φάτις.*

"Some settled word,"—i. e. "A rumor which infixes itself in the mind," and does not take to itself wings like a dream. Cp. the Homeric *τῇ δ' ἀπτερος ἐπλετο μῆθος*, and infr. 425, 6,

*βέβαχεν δφις οὐ μεθύστερον
* πτεροῦσσος * ὀπαδοῦσσος ὅπνου κελεύθοις.*

10. Ll. 286–9. *ὑπερτελής τε πόντον ὥστε νωτίσαι
ἰσχὺς πορευτοῦ λαμπάδος †πρὸς ἡδουὴν
πεύκη τὸ χρυσοφεγγές ὡς τις ἥλιος
σέλας παραγγέλασα Μαχίστου σκοπαῖς.*

The absence of a finite verb from these four lines is not satisfactorily defended by Hermann. The only question is where the lost word lies concealed. Professor Kennedy's *προβάζετο* (for *πεύκη* τὸ) is liable to the objection that a verb of rest is ill-suited to the energy of the passage. Besides, *πεύκη* is eminently the right word in the right place. The beacon on Mount Athos would naturally be of pine-wood, as that on Messapius (l. 295) was of heather, and the new subject comes rightly, with a pause after it, at the begin-

¹ I am told that Professor Goodwin has written a learned exposition of this passage, which I have not yet had an opportunity of seeing. Meanwhile I send in my own suggestion for what it is worth. L. C.

Professor Goodwin's article was published in the Transactions of the American Philological Association for 1877, p. 72 seqq., in which he gives from his own collation the exact readings of the Medicean, Florentine and Farnese MSS. The words τὸ δὲ προκλέειν and the colon after μέλλον do not appear in the Farnese, and in the Medicean were added by a later hand in blacker ink. Professor Goodwin follows the Farnese MS., construes τὸ μέλλον ἐπεὶ γένοιτ’ ἄν κλίνοις as = τὸ μέλλον κλίνοις ἄν, ἐπεὶ γένοιτο, citing Aristoph. Pac. 137 for the hyperbaton of ἄν, and pointing out the assimilation of ἐπεὶ γένοιτο from ἐπειδὰν γένηται. He does not accept Wellauer's σύνορθρον αἴνας, but reads σύνορθρον αἴταις (cf. ἀνορθος and ἔξορθος), and refers αἴταις to the τέχναι Κάλχαντος, v. 248: *The future you can hear of when it comes; before that bid it farewell, and this is as well as to lament it beforehand; for [whatever we do] it will come out clear and plain in full accord with these (prophetic arts).* B. L. G.

ning of a line. The hypothesis of a lost line or two, in which Pelion would be mentioned, is made improbable by the appropriateness of l. 286 to describe a longer leap than heretofore, and of the words ὡς τις ἥλιος to indicate a light appearing from the northeast. It follows that an early conjecture, *ἰσχὺν* for *ἰσχύν*, is to be adopted, and that the missing verb must lurk in the phrase *πρὸς ἡδονήν*, of which no satisfactory explanation has been given. The termination of an aorist or imperfect is at once obtained by changing *η* of the last syllable to *ε*, and the remaining letters suggest some compound of *πρυς* or *πρῳ*, I conjecture *πρωήγυσεν*.

δέ περτελής τε, πόντων ὥστε νωτίσαι,
 * *ἰσχὺν πορευοῦ λαμπάδιν* * *προήγυσεν*
 πεύκη, τὸ χρυσοφεγγές, ὡς τις ἥλιος,
 σέλας παραγγεῖλασα Μαξίστου σκοπαῖς.

"And (a beacon of) pine-wood mounting so as to glance over the sea, sped forward the might of the traveler¹ lamp, passing on, like a sun, with golden radiance, the fire-message to Macistus' peak."

11. L. 304. In favor of Casaubon's *μοι χαρίζεσθαι* it may be observed that as the description comes nearer home, it is natural for the queen to speak of the lighting of the signal fires as a personal service done by her neighbors to herself.

12. L. 314. *νικᾶ δὲ πρῶτος καὶ τελευταῖος δραμών*.

"And victorious is he who ran from first to last." Clytemnestra is not explaining to the Argive elders the nature of the *λαμπαδηφορία*, which they know well, but is pointing out the difference between her own and the ordinary *λαμπαδηφόρων νόμοι*. The victory in the common torch-race was distributed amongst several runners, who had successfully passed the torch from hand to hand. But in the present case Hephaestus was the sole runner and sole victor, and he was *victor* in no ordinary sense, for he ran victoriously with news of victory. Hence *νικᾶ*, carrying this double association, holds the emphatic place in the line.

13. L. 336. *ώς δυσδαιμονες*— Sc. *όντες*, in the imperfect tense. "As men who had been tried with hardships."

14. L. 413. Without occupying space by a discussion of the various conjectures on this line, I will add one more suggestion:

ἌΛΑСΤΑ ΠΗΜΟΝΩΝ ΙΔΩΝ,

"Having seen" (i. e. experienced) "an unforgettable sorrow."

¹ See an article by Wm. Morice in the Cambridge Journal of Philology.

15. Ll. 494, 5, et seq. *μαρτυρεῖ δέ μοι χάστις
πηλοῦ ξύνουρος, διψία χόνις, τάδε, κ. τ. λ.*

Bishop Blomfield was, I believe, the first who suggested that these words applied not to a cloud of dust raised by the herald and his companions (cf. S. c. T. 81, 2, ib. 494), but to the dust and mud upon his clothes. It was perhaps natural that an English scholar should be reminded of Sir Walter Blount,

“Marked with the variation of each soil
Betwixt that Holmedon and this seat of ours,”

but it is strange that others should not have perceived the inappropriateness of such a remark as applied to the herald who is seen approaching from the neighboring shore (*ἀπ' ἀκτῆς*), where he has arrived by crossing the Aegean from Troy. The dust raised by his approach (perhaps not unaccompanied) at once shows his haste as the bringer of important tidings, and also proves that he is a real solid human being, and not a voiceless phantom or imponderable element, like the light which brought the earlier message. The speech clearly belongs to the Coryphaeus and not to Clytemnestra, who is obviously not present when ll. 546–50 are spoken.

16. L. 534. *ἀρπαγῆς τε καὶ χλωπῆς δίκην.*

The *theft* was proved by the disappearance of Helen; and when Paris refused to give her up, he showed himself to be not only a thief but a *robber*.

17. L. 612. *χαλκοῦ βαφάς.*

According to the old interpretation of these words, they were supposed to be equivalent to “the thing that is not.” But when it was shown that “bronze-dippings” (according to Mr. Browning’s quaint rendering) could not be thus described, a new line of explanation was pointed out by Hermann, who from the words in the Choephoroe (l. 1011), *ώς ἐβαψεν Αἴγισθου ξίφος*, inferred that *χαλκοῦ βαφάς* might be a figurative expression for “slaughter.” And he imagines Clytemnestra to say in effect, “I am as innocent of adultery as I am of murder.” But it is unlikely that in speaking to the chorus here she should have used figurative language, or made her illustration more obscure than her first expression. Here, if anywhere, we may expect the appearance of plain speaking. And the phrase is perfectly intelligible, if for “the thing that is not” we substitute “the thing that I know not.” The tempering of metal was a mechanic process, known to a class of mean craftsmen, and to few or none beyond it,—a mystery of low-born men—

the last thing therefore which a delicately nurtured princess could be expected to know. It is much as if a modern fine lady were to say, "I could no more think of doing such things than of shoeing a horse."

18. Ll. 615, 6.

*μανθάνοντί σοι
τοροῖσιν ἔρμηνεῦσιν.*

Are the "clear interpreters" the herald's ears?—i. e. you understand her meaning, if you hear her words.

19. L. 637. *χωρὶς ἡ τιμὴ θεᾶν.*

"The honor of the gods is to be kept apart," viz., from that of the Erinyes (infr. 645), who are spoken of as distinct from the gods in Eum. 197, 350, 361, 366, 386.

20. L. 767. *NEAPA ΦΑΟΥC CKOTON.*

In support of Ahrens' conjecture *ὅταν τὸ κύριον μόλη φάσι τόχου*, it has not been sufficiently noticed that *NEAPA* as a corruption may easily be accounted for, especially with *νεδῶνσαν* preceding, by supposing *HMEPA* to have existed as a gloss on *ΦΑΟC* and afterwards to have crept into the text.

21. L. 817. *χειρός*, the MS. reading, is preferable to *χεῖλος*, which implies that the vessel was all but full. *χειρός*, "from" or "by the hand," is introduced in opposition to *ἐλπίς*. "*Hope* alone came near to it: it was not *actually* replenished."

22. L. 864. *καὶ τὸν μὲν ἥκειν, κ. τ. λ.*

The paratactic structure of these words has led interpreters to miss the point of them. The meaning is, "No sooner had we announced his coming than another declared he was bringing home a worse evil than his death would have been." This covert allusion to Cassandra, who is standing beside the king, gives a natural indication of the bitterness which underlies the smooth hypocrisy of Clytemnestra's speech.

23. L. 871. Cp. S. c. T. 941, 2 (Paley).

*ὑπὸ δὲ σώματι γᾶς
πλοῦτος ἄβυσσος ἔσται.*

24. Ll. 933, 4. *K.* *γῆξω θεοῖς δεῖσας ἀν ὕδῳ ἔρδειν τάδε.*

A. *εἰπερ τις. εἰδὼς γ' εὖ τόδ' ἐξεῖπον *τάχος.*

Cl. "You might have vowed to the gods in some moment of alarm that you would do this as I now propose that you should. Might you not?"

Ag. "I might, if any man ever did. Yes, I say this unhesitatingly, because I know it so well."

I agree with Dr. Kennedy (Camb. Journal of Philology) that the meaning of $\eta\delta\xi\omega\ \dot{\alpha}v$ is determined by the comparison of l. 963. But I cannot think that $\tau\acute{e}\lambda\omega\varsigma$ is sound. The flaw, as it seems to me, lies here, and not in $\dot{\epsilon}\xi\epsilon\pi\tau\omega\nu$. This, the aorist of the immediate past, may rightly refer to $\varepsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\ \tau\iota\varsigma$, the words that have been just spoken. Agamemnon, after professing an unchangeable resolution, is surprised into sudden assent by Clytemnestra's subtly flattering reference to "the dangers he has passed." The words $\varepsilon\pi\tau\epsilon\rho\ \tau\iota\varsigma$ having escaped him, in spite of himself, he adds by way of excuse that his near acquaintance with danger made him speak unhesitatingly ($\tau\acute{a}\chi\omega\varsigma$),

25. Ll. 982-6. $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$.

I cannot think that $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\varsigma$ is the subject of $\pi\alpha\gamma\beta\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu$. Reading $\chi\rho\acute{o}\nu\varsigma\ \delta'\ \dot{\epsilon}\pi\tau\iota$, I would make $\sigma\tau\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$ the nominative to the verbs which follow. For the image of the army passing its prime cp. the words of Nicias in Thuc. 7, 14, $\beta\rho\alpha\chi\epsilon\iota\alpha\ \dot{\alpha}\chi\mu\dot{\eta}\ \pi\lambda\eta\rho\acute{o}\mu\alpha\tau\omega\varsigma$. The question remains whether the time referred to is the siege of Troy or the delay at Aulis. The latter has the advantage of restoring some clearness to a place which would be otherwise too obscure, by connecting the abiding presentiment which the Chorus here acknowledge with that of which the grounds were given in their first Ode (ll. 184-257).

"Why should this fear not leave me? It is long since the armada lost its bloom while moored upon the land, after setting forth to go beneath the walls of Troy,"—i. e. The event at Aulis which gave rise to my foreboding is so long past that my apprehensions are no longer justifiable. ' $\Upsilon\pi'$ $'\dot{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega\varsigma$ is in this case a slightly pregnant expression = $\dot{\nu}\pi'\ '\dot{\iota}\lambda\iota\omega\ \sigma\tau\alpha\tau\epsilon\upsilon\sigma\acute{o}\mu\epsilon\eta\varsigma$, and the "start" referred to is the departure from Nauplia. A *prima facie* objection to this explanation may be suggested by the rocky nature of the coast in the neighborhood of Chalcis, as contrasted with the shore of the Troad. But Col. Leake tells us that the bay of Voulkos, a little southward from Chalcis on the opposite side, has a sandy or oozy bottom. A similar expression occurs in the Homeric hymn to Apollo, with reference to the Crissaean gulf.

26. Ll. 1114-8. What is it that Cassandra sees? Surely the murderous contrivance which Clytemnestra avows in ll. 1382 foll., and which is exhibited in evidence of her crime in Cho. 980 foll.

(of which more hereafter). This being so, we cannot be wrong in explaining the words ἀλλ' ἄρχως . . . φόνον to mean “Nay, but the net that takes him to his rest, that is the accomplice in his murder!”

27. L. 1137. *θροῶ* must not be changed to *θροῖς*. It is better to change *†ἐπεγχέασα* to **ἐπεγχέαι*,—an epexegetic infinitive.

28. L. 1172. The intransitive meaning of *βαλῶ* is supported by Od. 11, 423, *χεῖρας ἀσέρων | βάλλον ἀποθνήσκων περὶ φασγάνῳ*. For it would be too ridiculous to join *χεῖρας βάλλον* there:

29. L. 1181. For *πνέων*, as referring not to a wind but to the wave itself, cf. Eur. Hipp. 1210 (*ἀφρὸν*) *πολὺν καχλάζον ποντίψ φυσήματι*.

30. Ll. 1271, 2. *καταγελωμένην μετὰ | φίλων, δπ' ἐχθρῶν.*

To what time does Cassandra here refer? If to any time at Troy, after her capture, how could she be mocked while under the protection of Agamemnon? If at Argos, have we not been witnesses of all that has happened since her arrival? The answer is that, for dramatic purposes, the harsh speeches of Clytemnestra, supra 1035 foll., supply a sufficient ground for this complaint. The words *μετὰ φίλων* consequently refer not to the Priamidae, but to Agamemnon.

31. L. 1300. *δ' ὁ θστατός γε τοῦ χρόνου πρεσβεύεται.*

That is, the latest moment is the best, where death is in question.

32. L. 1327–30. In these four lines, which Dindorf rightly gives to the Chorus (cf. supr. 351–4), I would retain the MS. reading *σκιὰ . . . τρέψειν*, and give the usual meaning to *ταῦτ' ἔχεινων μᾶλλον*, viz., “the latter more than the former.” “The prosperous course of human things may be turned aside by a shadow; and when they are unfortunate, they are like a painting which may be blurred out by throwing a wet sponge. The latter I pity much more than the former,”—i. e. I am more affected by the fate of Cassandra than by the fall of Troy.

33. L. 1343. *ἔσω,*

“In here,” within the palace. The word so explained has a distinct motive, and is not mere surplusage. In calling for rescue it is natural to indicate the place to which the rescue is to be brought.

34. Ll. 1391, 2. $\eta \deltaιδ\varsigma \nu\theta\tau\omega$
†γὰν εἰ σπορητός.

It deserves to be further considered whether

$\deltaιδ\varsigma \nu\theta\tau\omega$
**γανῆ*

is not on the whole a better emendation than Porson's

* διοσδότῳ
* γάνετ.

The verb coming at the beginning of the line is more expressive than the dative.

35. L. 1395. ἐπισπένδειν νεκρῷ.

Clytemnestra has already in her mind the thought of a sacrifice, which she repeats infr. 1433. Libations were poured over the victim of an ordinary sacrifice. But the case is altered where the "victim" is the dead body of a man (*νεκρός*).

36. L. 1458 foll. The lost words may have drawn out the parallel between the two daughters of Tyndareus. The life now sacrificed by one of them is worth the many lives whose loss was caused by the other.

37. L. 1596. Mr. Paley does not seem to observe that ἀσημα . . . ἀντῶν means "without the marks for recognition which they" (the extremities) "would have afforded."

38. Ll. 1625-7. γύναι, σὺ τοὺς ἥκοντας ἐξ μάχης νέον—
οἰκουρός, εὐνὴν ἀνδρὸς αἰσχύνοντος ἄμα,
ἀνδρὶ στρατηγῷ τόνδ' ἔβυντενσας μόρον;

Retaining this, the MS. reading, I would render: "Lady, didst thou (act thus) by him who is lately come from war? Keeping house for him, didst thou plot this death against the general of the host,—at the same time dishonoring thy husband's bed?" The Coryphaeus turns contemptuously from Aegisthus, and for the first time openly accuses the queen of unchastity. Her avowal, supra 1435 foll., now confirmed by the conduct of Aegisthus, has at last opened their eyes, and draws this taunt from them.

39. L. 1657. πρὸς τὸ δόμον τεπρωμένους.

What is the "house appointed" for the elders? May not νομούς, "sphere," "place," "position," be the original reading, which, being changed to νόμους, has been misunderstood, and altered to δόμους? Cp. Eum. 576, where νόμω, the true reading, has been altered to δόμων.

These notes might be continued with remarks on the Choephoroe and Eumenides. But the reader who has followed so far, whether he agrees with me or not, has probably had enough. I will therefore conclude with one more observation. It has been commonly assumed that in Aeschylus, as in Homer and Sophocles, Clytemnestra murders her husband with an axe. But how can this be

reconciled with the words of Orestes (already quoted from Choeph. 1011), ὡς ἔβαψεν Αἰγίσθους ξίφος? For Aegisthus had no share in the actual murder. Clytemnestra did all with her own hand. The question to be answered was, " how came she by a lethal weapon?" And the answer is that Aegisthus, who was in the plot, had secretly provided her with his sword. In the Choephoroe, when in danger of her life from the return of her son, she calls loudly for a laborer's axe (Cho. 889-91). But at this point (the crisis of the trilogy) her criminal attitude is declared, and there is no one to " call her power to account."

LEWIS CAMPBELL.